REMARKS

Claims 1 and 73 are currently amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 55 and 120, respectively, each suggested as allowable subject matter (in both the first and second office actions) if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of their respective base claims (there having been no intervening claims).

Eighteen claims are cancelled: 4, 5, 31, 34, 37, 53, 55, 59, 60, 76, 77, 100, 101, 102, 118, 120, 124, and 125.

Claims 2, 3, 6-30, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38-52, 54, 56-58, 61-72, 74, 75, 78-99, 103-117, 119, 121-123, and 126-136, are withdrawn. Of these, claims 54, 67, 119, and 131 are also currently amended to correct typographic errors.

Independent claims 137, 138, 140, and 141 have been amended to more clearly point out the invention.

Newly added independent claims 143 and 146 and their dependent claims 144, 145, and 147-159 are directed, along with claims 137-142, to subject matter that was suggested as allowable in the first office action dated 6/4/2009, but in the second office action dated 3/9/2010 was rejected on the combination of Hanson [EP 820 180] in view of Dobronsky [US 7,159,192].

PROVISIONAL ELECTION OF SPECIES

With the foregoing amendments to claims 1 and 73, the Examiner may find that the claims 1 and 73 and those dependent upon them are a distinct species from claims 137-159. Still, a restriction requirement is neither expected nor desired for two reasons.

First, the former claims (1, 73, and their dependent claims) contain the limitations from claims 55 and 120 that have been suggested by the Examiner as allowable subject matter in both of the last two office actions.

Second, the latter claims (137-159) are based upon key limitations previously suggested as allowable, but in the present office action were rejected on the basis of art that postdates Applicants' priority date, as argued below.

Thus, Applicants hope that the claims presented impose no serious burden with respect to search and that claims of both species will be found allowable in the next office action.

However, if that is not the case, Applicants provisionally elect a species that includes claims 137-162 for examination on the merits.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST 103(a) REJECTION IN VIEW OF DOBRONSKY

In section 11 of the office action, the rejection applied to claims 1, 73, and 97, was applied to claims 137-142.

In section 1 of the office action, claims 1 and 73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hanson.

In section 9 of the office action, claims 28, 59, 60, 97, 124, and 125 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson [EP 820 180] in view of Dobronsky [US 7,159,192].

Given that claims 137-142 each incorporated the bookmark sharing limitations similar to the claims rejected in section 9, Applicants believe that the Examiner intended to constrain his rejection of claims 137-142 to the same basis as in section 9.

DOBRONSKY IS NOT PRIOR ART GIVEN APPLICANTS' PRIORITY DATE

The Dobronsky patent cited (US 7,159,192), filed 22 April 2003, is not prior art given Applicants' earlier priority date of October 10, 2002, the filing date of Provisional U.S. Patent Application No. 60/417,734, to which Applicants' claimed benefit in paragraph [0001] of the present invention.

The '192 Dobronsky patent cited by the Examiner is a continuation of Dobronsky's US application 10/396,647 filed on 23 May 2001, which in turn is a continuation of Dobronsky's US application 09/864,551 filed on 13 August 1999 (now US 7,222,303). However, neither of the earlier applications disclose FIG 3 elements 306, 308, 310, 312, and 314 of Dobronsky '192 pointed out by the Examiner, nor the corresponding discussion from column 8 line 5 through column 9 line 64 of the Dobronsky '192.

Please extend the time for response two months to August 9, 2010. Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the required fees for the two-month extension, to Deposit Account No. 04-0258 of Davis Wright Tremaine LLP. If additional fees are believed necessary, the Commissioner is further authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 04-0258.

All of the claims remaining in the application are now believed to be allowable. Favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

If questions remain regarding this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (206) 757-8133.

Respectfully submitted,
Jordan K. Weisman and William G. Redmann
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP

By /George C. Rondeau, Jr./
George C. Rondeau, Jr.
Registration No. 28893

1201 Third Avenue, Suite 2200
Seattle, WA 98101-3045
Phone: (206) 622-3150
Facsimile: (206) 757-7700